UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/550,805 | 07/12/2006 | Tominaga Koji | FUJ0001US | 3990 | |
| 23413 CANTOR COL | 7590 12/20/201 LBURN LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| 20 Church Stree 22nd Floor | | LUKE, DANIEL M | | | |
| Hartford, CT 06 | 5103 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2813 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 12/20/2010 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/550,805 | KOJI ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| DANIEL LUKE | 2813 | | |

| | DANIEL LUKE | 2813 | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c | idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date | · · · | 36(a) and the appropria | te extension fee | | | | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da | inally set in the final Offi | ce action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | is of the date of e appeal. Since | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered b | ecause | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ooddoo | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially re | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rej | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. | 01 See attached Nation of Nan Co | mpliant Amandmant | (DTOL 204) | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | mphant Amendment | (FTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling th | | | | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected to the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | II be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| P. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). | | | | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: | | | | | | | | |
| (Maddle according to the control of | | | | | | | | |
| /Matthew C. Landau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2813 | /D. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 2813 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are based on the criticality of the claimed range of the thickness of the partial insulating films. However, Applicant has not met the requirements for demonstrating the criticality of a claimed range as it is described in the MPEP.

Section 716.02(e) of the MPEP states that "An affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 must compare the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art to be effective to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979)." Applicant has failed to provide such an affidavit or declaration.

Furthermore, Applicant has the burden of establishing that the results are unexpected and significant. Section 716.02(b) I states "The evidence relied upon should establish 'that the differences in results are in fact unexpected and unobvious and of both statistical and practical significance.' Ex parte Gelles, 22 USPQ2d 1318, 1319 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992)". Applicant has not met this burden.